



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

fice meant, having been adequately warned. He knew, says Milton, that Eve was lost by her sin, so that with noble chivalry and devotion he decided to die with her. Milton's point, many times emphasized in his works, was that a man may well love a beautiful woman, but that he should not let his passion obscure his judgment, and should follow his conscience and his intelligence in spite of the lovely but capricious sex, lest "wommen shal him bringen to mischaunce." The statement, however, remains true and worthy of note, that Milton gave his epic the romantic motive of love.

ELLIOTT A. WHITE.

University of Missouri.

CHAUCER AND THE HOURS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN

Professor F. Tupper¹ has recently demonstrated beyond doubt that Chaucer, in composing the *Invocatio ad Mariam* which stands in the Prologue of the *Lyf of St. Cecile*, made direct use of the Hours of the B. V. M. A year and a half ago, while turning the pages of an English text of the *Mateyns of Oure Lady* in the Bodleian Library (ms. Ashmole 1288), I was so forcibly impressed by the similarity to Chaucer's phrases that I transcribed from it the passage which follows. It supplies, as will be seen, a somewhat closer parallel than the extract which Tupper reprints from Littlehales:

[fol. 49b] Antym of oure lady: Salue regina mater.

Heil qweene modir of merci. heil lijf swetnesse & oure hope: to þee we crien outlawid sones of eue. to þee we sigen weymentynge and wepinge in þis valey of teeris: hiȝe þou perfore oure aduocat turne to us þou [fol. 50] þi merciful igen. and schewe þou to us ihesu þe blessid fruyt of þi wombe aftir þis exilyng.

Versus. virgyne modir of þe chirche. Euerlastinge ȝate of glorie. ȝeue þou to us refuyt Anentis þe fadir & þe² sone.

Responsio. O merciful.

Versus. Virgyne merciful. virgyne piteuous. O marie swete virgyne. Heere þe preiers of meke men: to þee piteuously crynge.

Responsio: O piteuous.

Versus. ȝete out preiers to þi sone ficchid to

þe cros ful of woundis: and for us al forscourgid with þornes prickid ȝouen galle to drynke.

Responsio. O swete.

Versus. Glorious modir of god Of whom þe sone was fadir. Preie for us all þat of þee maken mynde.

Responsio. O meke.

Versus. Do awey blamys of wrecchidnesse Clense þe filþe of synners: ȝeue [fol. 50b] to us þoru þi preiers lijf of blessid men.

Responsio. O sely.

Versus. Reisid aboue heuenes And crowned of þi child. In þis wrecchid valey To gilty be lady of forgeuenesse.

Responsio. O holy.

Versus. þat he lose us fro synnes for þe loue of his modir & to þe kyngdom of clernesse lede us þe kyng of pitee.

Responsio. O merciful. O piteuous. O holy O meke O sely O swete marie heil.

Versus. Heil ful of grace þe lord is wiþ þee.

Responsio. Blessid be þou among alle women and blessid be þe fruyt of þi wombe. Preie we, &c.

Professor Tupper's further observation—it can hardly be termed a discovery—that saints' lives and Miracles of the Virgin (and, one may add, even romances) are frequently prefaced by Invocations, somewhat diminishes the force of his previous suggestion, that in the present instance Chaucer intended his Invocation as a "protest against Sloth in its phase of Undevotion."³ At least it may be doubted whether the "fine fitness" which he perceives here, in his attempt to arrange certain of the Canterbury Tales according to a scheme of the Seven Deadly Sins, was sufficiently obvious to be perceptible to a reader not already in the secret.

"The time-honored function of such a prelude as Chaucer's 'Invocacio ad Mariam,'" Professor Tupper concludes, "constitutes good ground for believing that it was composed at the same time as the Life of Saint Cecilia." But in one important respect Chaucer's Hymn to Mary differs from all the Invocations cited by Professor Tupper, and from all others with which I am acquainted. It does not stand at the beginning of the piece—as an Invocation should—but is introduced in the midst of the prologue, in such fashion that it can be re-

¹ *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Jan., 1915.

² Ms. þe repeated.

³ *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Assn.* XXIX, 107.

moved, not only without detriment, but with positive improvement, to the context. There is no need to repeat the considerations which I have elsewhere presented on this point,⁴ but the real problem is not affected by the fact that religious poems are frequently introduced by Invocations.

CARLETON BROWN.

Bryn Mawr College.

THOMAS EDWARDS'S SONNETS

In *Modern Language Notes* for April, 1905, Prof. E. P. Morton includes in a list of fifty sonnets written between 1658 and 1750 only the two sonnets of Thomas Edwards, 1746 and 1747, "discovered by Prof. Phelps." Neither Prof. Morton nor Prof. Phelps has indicated which of Edwards's sonnets these two were. However, at least thirteen of Edwards's sonnets were published before 1750 and two others in that year. The thirteen sonnets referred to were published in *A Collection of Poems by Several Hands*, edited by and printed for R. Dodsley, second edition, London, 1748, 8°, volume II, p. 323 ff. The thirteenth is inscribed, "To the Rt. Hon. Mr. ———, with the foregoing Sonnets." These sonnets do not appear in the duodecimo edition of Dodsley's Collection in the same year; they do appear in the later editions, 1755 and 1758, and in the seventh edition of the *Canons of Criticism*, 1765. The other two were printed in the fourth edition of Edwards's *Canons of Criticism*, 1750, and both are in ridicule of Warburton. The sonnet beginning "Tongue-doughty Pedant" is on page (14), and the one beginning "Rest, rest perturbed Spirit" is in the Appendix, p. 176.

CLARISSA RINAHER.

The University of Illinois.

BRIEF MENTION

Five years after the death of Adolf Tobler, and more than forty since he announced the work as forthcoming, the first *lieferung* of his

⁴ *Mod. Philol.* IX, 1-16.

Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch has now appeared (Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 25 *lieferungen*). The editor, Erhard Lommatsch, did not have a light task, for the cards on which the entries had been made were by no means in order for printing. The initial *lieferung* is largely given over to introductory matter, so that the dictionary text occupies only twenty-four out of the ninety-four pages. These bring us as far as the word *abevrer*, half of the forty-eight closely printed columns being devoted to the preposition *à*. In contrast with Godefroy, Tobler did not draw on unpublished documents, but hardly a printed text of the Old French literature escaped his analysis, as may be seen from an examination of the twenty-seven page list of works from which citations have been made. A test count of words in the two dictionaries indicates that in spite of the more compact typography of the Tobler the amount of material per column is approximately the same. About 4800 columns are promised for the Tobler as against some 24000 in the Godefroy. Yet Tobler's exceptionally full treatment of the preposition *à* is half as long again as Godefroy's, and the whole section so far covered in Tobler occupies nearly sixty per cent. of the corresponding words in Godefroy (even including the *complément*), so that it is difficult to see how the indicated limit can be maintained. In the descriptive and explanatory introduction, the editor has illustrated some of the manifold ways in which this mine of lexicographical material can be utilized to enrich our knowledge of French linguistics. It is a tragic coincidence that the publication of this work, the longest and most eagerly awaited of all that have been promised in Romance philology, begins at a time when few of the younger generation of those who watched for its coming will so much as learn of its appearance.

The *Modern Language Notes* is scarcely the appropriate place for an extended review of *Die Erste Deutsche Bibel* (Stuttgarter Literarischer Verein, 1904-15), nor, if it were, would it be an easy task to find the competent reviewer. With the appearance of the tenth and final volume, it seems fitting, however, to call at least passing attention to the completion of so monumental a work on the part of the American scholar, William Kurrelmeyer. The ten stately volumes now before us embody the results of twelve years of unwearied labor. Critical acumen, broad and sound learning, perseverance in the face of enormous obstacles, all these were needed to bring such a task to a successful conclusion.